

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present Application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Claims 18, 19, 28, 35, and 36 are currently being amended. No claims are being added and Claims 1-17 were previously canceled. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, following entry of this amendment, Claims 18-37 will be pending in this Application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2 of the Office Action, Claims 18 and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 2001-191361 A (“Mizuno”). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Amended independent Claim 18 recites a method of making a vehicle component including, among other elements, a “first shut-off member” having a “plurality of recesses” where the “plurality of recesses in the first-shut off member form a plurality of extensions in the first resin that interlock with a plurality of mating recesses in the second resin.”

Mizuno fails to disclose the above combination of elements. In fact, Mizuno fails to disclose any interlock between a “first resin” and a “second resin,” let alone, an interlock including a “plurality of extensions in the first resin” that engage a “plurality of mating recesses in the second resin” where the “plurality of recesses in the first-shut off member form” the “plurality of extension in the first resin,” such as is recited in Claim 18.

Claims 24-27 depend from Claim 18, and are believed to be patentable over Mizuno without regard to additional elements recited therein.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 5 of the Office Action, Claims 19-20, 22, and 28-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Mizuno in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0017360 (“Hiraiwa”). On page 6 of the Office Action, Claims 21 and 35-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Mizuno and Hiraiwa in view of Japanese Patent No. 2002-187166 A (“Ae”). On page 8 of the Office Action, Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Mizuno and Hiraiwa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,248,200 (“Daile”). Applicant traverses these rejections.

Amended independent Claim 18 recites a method of making a vehicle component including, among other elements, a “first shut-off member” having a “plurality of recesses” where the “plurality of recesses in the first-shut off member form a plurality of extensions in the first resin that interlock with a plurality of mating recesses in the second resin.”

Amended independent Claim 28 recites a method of making a vehicle component including, among other elements, a “shut-off member” having a “plurality of recesses” where the “plurality of recesses in the shut off member form a plurality of extensions in the first resin that interlock with a plurality of mating recesses in the second resin.”

Amended independent Claim 35 recites a method of making a vehicle component including, among other elements, “at least one of the first and second shut-off members having a plurality of recesses,” wherein the “plurality of recesses in one of the first and second shut off members form a plurality of extensions in the first resin that interlock with a plurality of mating recesses in at least one of the second and third resins.”

As discussed above, Mizuno fails to disclose this combination of elements. Moreover, the introduction of Hiraiwa, Ae, and/or Daile fail to cure the deficiencies of Mizuno, as none of these references disclose, teach, or suggest a method of making a vehicle component including, among other elements, a “shut-off member” having a “plurality of recesses” where the “plurality of recesses” in the shut off member “form a plurality of extensions in the first resin that interlock

with a plurality of mating recesses in the second resin.” Thus, Mizuno, whether taken alone or in any proper combination with Hiraiwa, Ae, and/or Daile, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the combination of elements provided above for each of Claims 18, 28, and 35.

Claims 19-27 depend from Claim 18, and are patentable over Mizuno, Hiraiwa, Ae, and/or Daile, for at least the same reasons as Claim 18 without regard to further elements recited therein. Claims 29-34 depend from Claim 28, and are patentable over Mizuno, Hiraiwa, Ae, and/or Daile, for at least the same reasons as Claim 28 without regard to further elements recited therein. Claims 36 and 37 depend from Claim 35, and are patentable over Mizuno, Hiraiwa, Ae, and/or Daile, for at least the same reasons as Claim 35 without regard to further elements recited therein.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

* * *

It is submitted that each outstanding objection and rejection to the Application has been overcome, and that the Application is in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of all pending claims.

It should also be noted that although arguments have been presented with respect to certain claims herein, the recited subject matter as well as various other subject matter and/or combinations of subject matter may be patentable for other reasons. Further, the failure to address any statement by the Examiner herein should not be interpreted as acquiescence or agreement with such statement. Applicants expressly reserve the right to set forth additional and/or alternative reasons for patentability and/or allowance with the present Application or in any other future proceeding, and to rebut any statement presented by the Examiner in this or other papers during prosecution of the present Application.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 22, 2012

By /Travis W. Simmons/

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (313) 234-2816
Facsimile: (313) 234-2800

Travis W. Simmons
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 69,164